

University of Rhode Island DigitalCommons@URI

Museum Services Act (1973)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts and
Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

1973

Museum Services Act (1973): Report 02

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_44

Recommended Citation

"Museum Services Act (1973): Report 02" (1973). *Museum Services Act (1973)*. Paper 13.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_44/13http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_44/13

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Museum Services Act (1973) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

and long-range purposes. In my view, any funds utilized for a bicentennial celebration should come from a separate authorization and appropriation.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 796. A bill to improve museum services. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am introducing at this time the Museum Services Act. The arts and humanities endowments have done an outstanding job servicing museums within the limited scope that the enabling legislation allows, but I believe that the problems of museums are so extensive and varied that a separate program should be instituted for them.

Presently museums are eligible for funds from several Federal Government sources. The Smithsonian Institution, under the National Museum Act, provides technical assistance, a function it is uniquely qualified to fulfill. Those of us who have studied the problems confronted by museums believe that the arts and humanities endowments should not, given their limited scope and funding, utilize those funds for bricks and mortar, for renovation, new construction—for physical facilities for museums.

The proposed Museum Services Act will provide an across-the-board program of support such as is now available to libraries. This assistance would become the base for a variety of supportive programs of essential value to our Nation's museums.

From my first years in this body, I have seen the concept of Federal aid to the arts and humanities grow from an idea to a viable, publicly supported, quality program, as I have outlined previously. Yet, every study concerned with the future of our Nation's cultural activities reports that they remain in danger. Our per capita expenditure for this type of program compares unfavorably with other civilized nations. When we consider the gross national product of this country, the portion devoted to the support of cultural activities is minimal.

The legislation I am introducing today will not meet the underlying financial stress being faced by the cultural community. It will, however, provide an increased level of support throughout the Nation and perhaps what is more important, maintain, and increase the climate which will be conducive to the development of our cultural growth.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania):

S. 797. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make a comprehensive study of a high-speed ground transportation system between Washington, District of Columbia, and Annapolis, Md., and a high-speed marine vessel transportation system between the Baltimore-Annapolis area in Maryland and the Yorktown-Williamsburg-Norfolk area in Virginia, and to authorize the construction of such

system if such study demonstrates their feasibility. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BICENTENNIAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEMONSTRATION ACT

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, along with 14 other Members of the Senate, I introduce the Bicentennial Advanced Technology Transportation System Demonstration Act. Senators cosponsoring this measure with me are: CASE, CRANSTON, DOMINICK, EAGLETON, FANNIN, GOLDWATER, GRAVEL, HATFIELD, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, MATHIAS, METCALF, RANDOLPH, and SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

This bill, identical to S. 4023, introduced on September 25 of last year, would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to undertake a feasibility study of a combined and coordinated land and water transportation system consisting of a tracked air cushion vehicle, or other high-speed ground transportation system, operating between the Baltimore-Annapolis area in Maryland and the Yorktown-Williamsburg-Norfolk in Virginia. The feasibility study, which is to be completed no later than 9 months after enactment, will determine the feasibility, social advisability, economic impact, and economic practicability of the marine and land transportation system.

During this investigation, the Secretary of Transportation is expected to consult closely with the State and local governments.

This demonstration futuristic transportation system in the Nation's Capital area will provide the highest visibility for advanced intermodal transportation systems available to large numbers of people at high speed. At the same time, it will link these most historical significant areas of our country with the time of the bicentennial celebration.

Mr. President, on December 7, 1972, the Commerce Subcommittee on Surface Transportation held an all day hearing on this proposal. I want to thank Chairman MAGNUSON; Senator CORTON, the ranking minority member of the committee; and Senator HARTKE, the chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, for scheduling the hearing. I also want to thank Tom Allison, committee counsel, for his outstanding help and assistance. I had the pleasure of presiding over this hearing which indicated strong and broad support for the proposal and emphasized the necessity for prompt action by the Congress if this futuristic transportation system were going to be in place by the bicentennial.

I was aware of the time problem when the bill was initially introduced. That is why I drafted the original bill, not only to authorize the feasibility study, but also to authorize the construction of the system, if the study demonstrated its feasibility and the Secretary of Transportation recommended the establishment of all or part of the system.

I believe this procedure is necessary because of the time problem. Congress, of course, would have the final say, following the completion of the feasibility study, through the appropriations process.

Last summer, the Washington area on

a number of occasions suffered under a blanket of pollution. Fortunately, to the great relief of the area residents, nature came to our rescue and the pollution was pushed away. In addition, traffic congestion continues to plague our citizens as they inch their way to work each day. This combination of pollution and congestion here, and in other metropolitan areas, are daily reminders of the desperate need to accelerate the Nation's search for alternatives and better methods of moving citizens, particularly in population centers.

Also, in 3 years the Nation will celebrate its 200th birthday. During this bicentennial observation, over 40 million visitors are expected to come to the Nation's Capital area. I believe the bicentennial event and the transportation needs of the Nation combine to give us a unique opportunity to create a transportation showplace that will provide the many visitors to the Capital area with an exciting means of seeing the historical cities and sights of the region, as well as the opportunity to provide a practical demonstration of a technology advanced intermodal transportation system which will attract national and international attention and recognition and demonstrate to the world that the United States will continue its leadership in the world of tomorrow.

Historically, transportation has not only played an important role in the development of this Nation, but has also figured importantly in major world expositions throughout the last of the century, particularly when the definitions broadened as it should be to include the provision for transportation arteries sufficient to handle the traffic generated by the world exposition.

A study of such major world expositions indicate that numerous permanent facilities were designed and constructed in time to serve these events and they then became integral features of the areas transportation network. As early as 1885, the world renowned Champs d'Elysses was massively redesigned and enlarged to service the Paris Fair of that year. More recently, the 1962 Seattle Fair brought a successful monorail system to that city. The monorail was immensely successful as a public attraction and service, so that its full cost of construction, \$3.5 million was amortized during the exposition. Today the monorail remains as a link and an attraction, primarily benefiting tourist and convention attendees who use the Seattle center facilities. The 1967 Montreal Expo resulted in an entirely new metro being completed and the 1968 Mexico City Olympic games served as a catalyst for the installation of a new subway system and highways. These are but a few of the significant "spillovers" from these events, and all still remain to serve the people of their respective cities. The recent Transpo indicated the public and Nation's interest in transportation.

Few would deny that we desperately need breakthroughs in the transportation area. A tracked air cushion vehicle operating between the District of Columbia area and Annapolis in conjunction with a high-speed marine vessel between

HISTORY OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1973—NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

	Arts		Humanities			Arts		Humanities		
	Authori- zation	Appro- priation	Authori- zation	Appro- priation		Authori- zation	Appro- priation	Authori- zation	Appro- priation	
Fiscal 1966:					Fiscal 1971:					
Program.....	\$5,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,500,000	Program.....	\$12,875,000	\$8,465,000	\$17,000,000	\$11,060,000	
Funds to match private donations.....	2,250,000	34,308	5,000,000		State councils.....	4,125,000	4,125,000			
Subtotal.....	7,250,000	2,534,308	10,000,000	2,500,000	Funds to match private dona- tions.....	3,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	
Fiscal 1967:					Subtotal.....	20,000,000	15,090,000	20,000,000	13,560,000	
Program.....	5,000,000	4,000,000	5,000,000	2,000,000	Fiscal 1972:					
State councils.....	2,750,000	2,000,000			Program.....	21,000,000	20,750,000	26,500,000	24,500,000	
Funds to match private donations.....	2,250,000	1,965,692	5,000,000	106,278	State councils.....	5,500,000	5,500,000			
Subtotal.....	10,000,000	7,965,692	10,000,000	2,106,278	Funds to match private dona- tions.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	
Fiscal 1968:					Subtotal.....	30,000,000	29,750,000	30,000,000	28,000,000	
Program.....	5,000,000	4,500,000	5,000,000	3,500,000	Fiscal 1973:					
State councils.....	2,750,000	2,000,000			Program.....	28,625,000	27,825,000	35,500,000	34,500,000	
Funds to match private donations.....	2,250,000	674,291	5,000,000	325,257	State councils.....	6,875,000	6,875,000			
Subtotal.....	10,000,000	7,174,291	10,000,000	3,825,257	Funds to match private dona- tions.....	4,500,000	3,500,000	4,500,000	3,500,000	
Fiscal 1969:					Subtotal.....	40,000,000	38,200,000	40,000,000	38,000,000	
Program.....	6,000,000	3,700,000	8,000,000	3,700,000	Total.....	141,000,000	116,721,166	143,750,000	101,004,008	
State councils.....	2,000,000	1,700,000			Private donations.....		16,548,548		13,194,000	
Funds to match private donations.....	3,375,000	2,356,875	3,375,000	1,262,473	Total, Office of Education.....		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Subtotal.....	11,375,000	7,756,875	11,375,000	4,962,473	Transfer, National Museum Act funds.....		100,000		100,000	
Fiscal 1970:					Total, available for obliga- tion.....		134,369,714		115,298,008	
Program.....	6,500,000	4,250,000	9,000,000	6,050,000						
State councils.....	2,500,000	2,000,000								
Funds to match private dona- tions.....	3,375,000	2,000,000	3,375,000	2,000,000						
Subtotal.....	12,375,000	8,250,000	12,375,000	8,050,000						

The arts and humanities program is aimed at helping to create a climate in which these two most important and related cultural areas may flourish. I believe that the Arts Endowment and the Humanities Endowment have made great progress in fostering this climate.

When we consider the lack of our Government's support for the arts and its relative paucity of emphasis on the humanities and on the contributions of our Nation's scholars prior to enactment of this legislation in 1965, and when we look at the wide variety of programs both endowments—guided by their eminently qualified private citizens councils—have initiated, we can see how much this legislation has advanced our Nation's well-being.

Young artists and scholars have been aided, the more established ones have been given national recognition and encouragement to pursue their work, innovative programs have stemmed from the knowledge and wisdom of the two councils and from the leadership the chairmen have provided. Great art organizations in dire financial need have been assisted or rescued and given new ability to continue and improve. Matching grant principles of funding have served to engender new sources of private support and are responsible for new partnerships between Government and the cultural community.

Before this law came into being, only a handful of States had any sort of program to support the arts. Now each State has an established State art agency, growing through matching Federal funds and bringing increasing encouragement to the development of the arts at community and local levels; and the Humanities Endowment is also working with the States in regional areas.

Private citizen groups throughout the country have lauded this whole program as being of essential and central value to our Nation's future.

As the Senate sponsor of the original arts and humanities legislation, it was my pleasure to forecast such possibilities, and it has been my pleasure to see them come at least to partial fruition.

Indeed, we have witnessed the genesis and growth of the climate we sought to help create. Thought "the quality of life" is an often used phrase, it is at the very basis of this legislation. Only in such a climate can our artists and scholars best contribute their talents to our people. And it is in terms of this climate that we should think of our bicentennial—not just as a goal in itself, but as a springboard toward the third century of our Nation's life and future centuries. In my view, only in these terms does an actual bicentennial celebration relate to the long-range work of the arts and humanities program.

If a climate for the encouragement of our cultural well-being has been so assisted, and if it has grown in meaning and effectiveness—as I so strongly believe it has—now it should be allowed to advance toward its full potentials, so that we can truly take our place among the leading civilizations of the world, which throughout history have considered that these cultural areas have an abiding importance and value. History has judged leading civilizations in these terms, and history will judge our own civilization as it further develops in this fashion.

Let me say in particular that I am especially pleased that Senator JAVITS is cosponsoring this legislation. He was a pioneer in this area long before I became involved myself. As we do now, he and I have joined together in the past, and at

the inception of this legislation, to make possible the creation of the arts and humanities program and to reauthorize its advancement.

It is my understanding that some thought has been given to utilizing the services of both the Humanities and Arts Endowments in the bicentennial celebration. I will not at this time go into the shortcomings of the present Bicentennial Commission. These are known to us all. I do feel that an attempt to involve the endowments directly in the funding of the bicentennial program could well be detrimental to their basic programs. Put simply, I would hate to see them tarnished by the same brush that has so sullied the reputation of the Bicentennial Commission and confused planning to date.

What is more important is the long-range effect which such an action can have on the endowments. I believe that the funding of specific commemorative celebrations could well conflict with the goal of the endowments, namely the encouragement of long-range quality in their respective fields. We must admit that a bicentennial celebration carries implicitly with it the burden of some political interest and possibly preset allocation of funds to each State or area—an approach inconsistent with the history and purpose of the endowments.

How do we balance a specialized approach to a bicentennial celebration with the quest for quality of the endowments? I expect to explore the question of the endowments' participation in funding of the bicentennial activity during hearings on this legislation.

In any event, I am opposed to the use of funds authorized and appropriated for the regular purposes of the endowments, in ways inconsistent with those broad